DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 487 32 EA 003 720

TITLE	State of Tennessee Annual Evaluation Report: Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10, Fiscal Year 1970.
INSTITUTION	Tennessee State Dept. of Education, Nashville.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Tennessee

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Tennessee State Department of Education; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, State ESEA Title I personnel, and university personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff and university consultants; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. Related documents are EA 003 692 and EA 003 721. (EA)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053487

STATE OF TENNESSEE

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

ESEA TITLE I

1969-70

EA 003 720

Department of Education

E. C. Stimbert, Commissioner

STATE OF TENNESSEE

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

TITLE I

Elementary and Secondary
Education Act of 1965
Public Law 89-10

Fiscal Year 1970

E. C. Stimbert, Commissioner
Department of Education

Introduction

This report fulfills the obligation of the Tennessee State Department of Education to file an annual evaluation report with the United States Office of Education. The report is divided into five major parts. They are (1) Educational Achievement, (2) Changes in Administrative Structure and Educational Practices, (3) Coordination with other Federally Funded Programs, (4) Inservice Training, (5) Parent and Community Involvement.

During FY'68 the Tennessee State Department of Education contracted with a state university to develop an evaluation design. The design was to have utility with projects or programs at the local school or school system level and with state programs.

This approach to evaluation was initiated in order to (1) provide a planning mechanism compatible with a management systems approach, and (2) to provide a basis for training existing personnel in program evaluation since the number of persons with skills in evaluation is limited.

The evaluation design is now being used on a field trial basis with ESEA Title III projects. Early indicators of its usefulness are promising. However, initial experiences with the design indicated a need for modification before wide application is affected. These modifications are being completed at the present time. A tentative outline follows:

A Tentative Outline
of the
Tennessee Planning and Evaluation Design

Phase I

I. Status Study

A. State educational goals

B. Describe current status

1. Define area of operation
2. Describe the environment
   a. Community
   b. School
3. Gather readily attainable information
   a. Pupil personnel records
   b. Personnel records
   c. Curriculum
   d. Out-of-school data
4. Search for additional data

C. Organize data file

D. Analyze information
1. Identify educational needs
2. Determine underlying causes
3. Identify educational assets

Phase 2

II. Program Planning

A. Determine preliminary objectives directed toward identified need and general educational goals
1. Who will be affected (population)
2. Way they will be affected (behavior)
3. Treatment that brings about change (program)
4. Time interval

B. Develop program
1. Examine alternative solutions for meeting objectives
2. Consider constraints and resources for each solution
3. Select most appropriate solution
4. Select appropriate program activities for solution
5. Develop supportive services

6. Develop operational pattern or organizational structure
    a. Define responsibilities
    b. Clarify lines of communication
7. Assess capabilities for carrying out planned program and make necessary adjustments

C. Develop procedural plan for assessment-an organized plan for providing information which will help guide future educational programs
1. Consider various appropriate assessment techniques
2. Select most appropriate technique; consider whether or not modifications should be made
3. Determine general means of measurement
    a. Types of measurement devices needed
    b. Tentative selection
4. Develop judgmental criteria-proficiency level in terms of project
5. Assess capabilities for carrying out selected assessment technique make adjustments as needed

D. Develop calendar of events as an aid in planning and scheduling all major events in advance
1. The major activities that will take place
2. The date that these activities are expected to take place
3. The materials and facilities which will be needed
4. The personnel responsible for carrying out the activities
5. The date the activity is completed

E. Develop monitoring system, a tool to see that the program is being implemented and conducted as planned
1. Provide accurate picture of implementation of projects
2. Allow for periodic checks on progress toward objectives
3. Reveal strengths and/or weaknesses in proposed plan
4. Provide the decision-maker with the information on which to base judgments
5. Designate those people responsible for implementing the monitoring system

Phase 3

III. Program Operation

A. Implement planned program

B. State specific objectives-further refinement of preliminary objectives
   1. Population-those who are affected
   2. Program-the treatment or program innovation
   3. Behavior-the desired change in behavior
   4. Measurement technique-the type of measurement used to assess the behavior change
   5. Proficiency level-how well the learner must perform to reach the desired behavior
   6. Time interval-the time needed to achieve an objective

C. Select and/or develop measurement instruments-directed toward the specific objectives

D. Implement monitoring system
   1. Make periodic observations
   2. Record descriptive data
   3. Use measurement instruments as scheduled

E. Maintain record of events and activities
   1. Check against calendar of events
   2. Give descriptive history of project as it develops
   3. Point up strengths and weaknesses in planned calendar of events

F. Analyze available data for program modification

G. Identify program design defects and assessment technique defects

H. Modify program or assessment technique as needed

Phase 4

IV. Program Outcome

A. Complete data collection for total program

B. Analyze data concerning pre-post status and change measures

C. Interpret data in terms of judgmental criteria

D. Formulate recommendations for future action such as re-cycling, expansion, modification, or termination

E. Disseminate results as planned; other facets of dissemination may be built in at appropriate points in the program

The revised design will be published before the beginning of FY'72.

Workshops of short duration were conducted by Department staff for local school system ESEA Title I directors during the spring of 1970. These workshops focused on the development of behavioral objectives.

During the spring of 1971 conferences will be conducted for local school system superintendents and supervisors. A major objective of these sessions is to give conceptual visibility to the planning and evaluation design.

In-depth workshops on the design and evaluation technique for local school system personnel with program assessment responsibilities are planned for the spring and summer of 1971. Television tapes on ESEA Title I evaluation are being developed utilizing the planning and evaluation design. These tapes will be used for local school system inservice education.

Field trials of the modified design will be conducted during FY'72. If the field trials indicate the design is effective, wide application is expected during FY'73.

During the development of the planning and evaluation design, the Tennessee State Department of Education has monitored programs, initiated a needs assessment and gathered information that would yield gross indicators of the impact of various education projects and programs utilizing federal funds. Material included in this report is presented within this context.

Educational Achievement

Demonstrating the effectiveness of Title I projects by standardized achievement tests presents serious measurement and evaluation problems. The diversity of objectives, interventions, and evaluation strategies among projects forms the major barriers to generating meaningful state-wide summary data. These problems are compounded by internal problems such as (1) weaknesses in available instruments to measure school-effected change, (2) selecting suitable control groups and equating scores of different tests.

In spite of these problems, the Tennessee State Department of Education drew together compilable test data from the LEA reports. Following are some summary statements and gross, but sound, interpretations of the data.

1. One hundred and forty-five project reports indicate movement toward objectives either by process evaluation or by product evaluation.

2. Sixty-eight of the 145 projects contain achievement test data.
3. A few LEA's devised comprehensive evaluation strategies with built-in statistical analysis of test data to show that the expenditure of Title I funds did make a significant difference.
4. Even though many LEA reports did not include a statistical analysis of test scores, and the gain in comparison with pre-test data or with national norms is slight, none of the reports indicates that Title I funds did not make a difference.
5. Seventy of the evaluation reports are for Title I supported kindergartens. Twenty-three reports include test data to show progress.
6. Data pulled from a sample of kindergarten reports, which may or may not be representative of the total number, show that roughly seventy-five percent of the pupils had moved to a readiness-to-read status as defined in the Metropolitan Readiness Test Manual.
7. Forty-five of the projects, representing 27,348 pupils, contain achievement test data which may or may not be representative of the total number of pupils in the 147 Title I projects. A gross summary of this data gives a .9 grade equivalent gain for the 27,348 pupils in all grade levels combined. The .9 grade equivalent

gain suggests that the typical project pupil gained almost as much during one year as the typical student in the national sample.

Changes in Administrative Structure and Educational Practices

Local school systems were asked to include in their evaluation reports a response to the questions: Has your Title I program affected the administrative structure of your agency, and have educational practices in your system been changed as a result of changes in the administrative structure?

One hundred and forty-one local school systems indicated that Title I programs had affected their administrative structure and that changes in educational practices had resulted. Four reported no changes had resulted from Title I programs.

The following items reported by local school systems are indicative of changes in administrative structure and educational practices.

1. Administrative Structure
   a. The addition of administrative, supervisory and clerical staff to implement Title I programs
      the necessity of designing Title I programs as an integral part of a comprehensive compensatory educational program and the obligation to consider the relationship of the Title I program to the

regular school program have resulted in a significant increase in the involvement of staff and individual teachers in policy formation, curriculum planning, and administrative decisions.

b. The functions of the advisory committees in the determination of priority needs has resulted in a significantly broader acceptance by boards of education of recommendations by lay groups.

c. The design of programs to meet priority needs of educationally deprived children reflects a much wider practice of in-depth planning by principals, teachers, parents, and lay groups.

d. The necessity to disseminate information relative to Title I has resulted in a meaningful exchange of information between local school systems. The more rural or isolated school districts reported this exchange of information to be especially helpful to them in program planning and evaluation.

e. Approximately 90 percent of the local school systems reports indicated that the children of administrative/supervisory staff had resulted in significant increases in coordination between the organizational divisions of their system. This coordination of the total activities of the administrative and instructional

divisions were most significant in curriculum development, attendance, pupil personnel services, and inservice training programs for both professional and nonprofessional personnel.

2. Educational Practices

   a. Each of the local school systems reported a significant increase in individualized instruction. The increases reported generally evolved from:

      (1.) The assignment to the eligible centers of teacher aides and other nonprofessional personnel.

      (2.) Significant increases in instructional materials, supplies, and equipment.

      (3.) Project/program development design requiring assessment of needs and assignment of priorities and the development of measurable objectives related to needs.

   b. An estimated 75 percent of the systems reported significant increases in the awareness of a need for accountability.

   c. Fifty percent of the local systems reported that the use of consultants in preschool teacher training and in inservice education sessions had resulted in significant changes in teacher attitudes toward research and evaluation.

3. Coordination with other Federally Funded Programs

The descriptions of the coordination of Title I programs with other federally funded programs indicated that while there was a generally high level of awareness of the nature and content of other federally funded programs, the resources of these agencies were not used at a level commensurate with this awareness.

1. Each of the reporting local school systems indicated full use of the national school lunch program and its related programs such as special milk programs.
2. Less than fifty percent of the local school systems reported the coordinated use of other federally funded programs in meeting high priority needs.
3. Many local school systems reported either directly or by inference, the need for help in designing an effective, coordinated compensatory program using all available resources.

Inservice Training

Each reporting local school system recognized a responsibility to respond to, and reported on, the activities related to regulations requiring inservice training programs. Inservice is to be specifically directed toward Title I programs and the needs of Title I staff, and should allow the professional staff and the aides to participate together in the program.

1. One hundred of the local school systems reported the inservice training to have been a part of the preschool inservice training usually held during the week prior to the beginning of the school year.
2. Forty systems indicated, without detail, that inservice training of Title I staff was designed and implemented during the project and that provisions were made for inservice training of teachers and aides together.
3. As indicated in the description of educational practices about 40 percent of the local systems reported inservice training of Title I staff, both professional and non-professional, as an entity rather than a component of the regular inservice training.
4. Thirty local school systems reported that inservice training of Title I staff was a part of the required ten days of inservice training funded from state and local sources.

Parent and Community Involvement

State and federal guidelines/program guides give detail of the requirement of local advisory committees and of the necessity for parent and community involvement in program planning and project implementation.

All of the reporting systems described the nature and extent of the parent-community involvement. The extent of involvement reported ranged from little involvement reported by 10 percent of the systems to significant involvement in 25 percent of the systems.

1. Eighty percent of the 145 systems reporting on the activities of nine advisory committees reported that their contribution to project planning, development, and implementation generally ended with project planning and development and did not carry over into the implementation of project activities.
2. Visits to schools and observation of project activities by parents were reported as the major activity in which parents were involved. Local systems reported a discernable increase in understanding by teachers of the implication of environmental factors in behavioral patterns and in the learning processes.
3. Less than 10 percent of the local systems reported a significant level of volunteer work by parents or other members of the community.
4. The most consistent participation by organized systems was that of the P.T.A.
5. Supervision of recreation, transportation for field trips, transportation to clinics, and caring for instructional supplies, helping to organize and transport

children to centers for medical, dental and optical examinations were activities most frequently identified as those in which volunteer parents participated.

6. Relatively few local systems reported that parents of children participating in programs funded by ESEA Title I were employed as teacher aides or other non-professional personnel.